one State predominate in the proposed new ninth circuit.

The majority acknowledged that California will undoubtedly predominate in the new ninth circuit. But the majority also insisted that this situation is not without precedent in the court of appeals. The fact is that California would predominate in the new Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals to a degree that is without precedent or parallel. According to the majority's own figures on the other circuits dominated by one State, New York contributes 87 percent of the caseload of the second circuit; Texas contributes only 69 percent of the fifth circuit's caseload. In the proposed new ninth circuit, however, 94 percent of the caseload would come from California.

That is an inordinate amount. It has never been done before in the history of this Nation. I would like to read one other section: ''To divide circuits in order to accommodate regional interests''—which is clearly what we are doing here. Let us not pretend. Every press release indicates that this is the reason for the split—regional interests, economic interests, criminal justice interests, the fact that a group of people do not like some decisions. I think that is true for everybody, for every appellate court decision that is made, there are some people who do not like the decision.

Former Chief Justice Warren Burger, rejected such a premise for dividing circuits as completely unacceptable, in testimony about an earlier version of this legislation. Chief Justice Burger stated:

I find it is a very offensive statement to be made, that a U.S. judge, having taken the oath of office, is going to be biased because of the economic conditions of his own jurisdiction.

Judge Charles Wiggins, Reagan appointee and former Republican Member of Congress, recently wrote a letter criticizing the political motivations behind the current proposal:

The majority report . . . contains the misleading statement that the recommended division of the ninth circuit is not in response to ideological differences between judges from California and judges from elsewhere in the circuit. I strongly disagree that such a motive does not, in fact, underlie the proposal for the change. Such a regionalization of the circuits in accordance with State interests is wrong. There is one Federal law. It is enacted by the Congress, signed by the President, and is to be respected in every State in the Union. The law in Montana and Washington is the same law as exists in Maine and Vermont. It is the mission of the Supreme Court to maintain one consistent Federal law. I do hope that you will challenge the supporters of the revision to explain the reasons justifying their proposal.

So, we know that with no public hearing on this proposal, we have an unprecedented, unparalleled proposal to split a court, giving the big weight to one State in that court, over 90 percent, and to do a split in a way that the judges are not fairly allocated. California, Hawaii, Guam, and the Northern Marianas Islands, with 62 percent of the caseload, will have far below the number of judges required to handle that, and seven States with 38 percent of the caseload would have a better allocation of judges.

This is a very serious proposal and it is being done in a way that is of very deep concern to this Senator: In an amendment found twice to be unrelated to the legislation contemplated by this body at that time—in a way that most certainly is going to create a problem in terms of the people of this side ever agreeing to a unanimous consent-request again.

So, Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I hope there would be due consideration given to these arguments. I think this is a very serious situation indeed, and I am hopeful that cooler heads will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nevada for his indulgence while a make a brief statement.

CLINTON POLICY FAILURE IN HAITI

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, today at Fort Polk, President Clinton welcomed our troops back from Haiti, and commended them for a job well done. It was appropriate for the President to do so. As they always do, U.S. forces exhibited a high degree of professionalism and courage in the performance of their mission.

However, it is quite another matter to suggest that the restoration of the Aristide regime was a worthwhile mission for U.S. forces to undertake in the first place. The Clinton administration has made Haiti a test case for their foreign policy. But what its Haiti policy has clearly revealed is that the administration's foreign policy is based on international social work, not on defending United States' interests.

Dozens of political and extra-judicial killings occurred after Aristide was returned to power, and are continuing under the Preval regime. There is credible information available to the President from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of State that indicates the involvement of officials in the Aristide and Preval governments in the planning, execution, and coverup of some of these murders.

Last year, an amendment authored by Senator DOLE passed Congress, requiring the President to certify the Haitian Government's progress in investigating political murders before the United States provided Haiti with anymore aid. But President Clinton could not certify that Haiti was investigating political murders allegedly committed by members of the Haitian Government for a very simple reason—the Haitian Government has steadfastly declined to undertake such investigations.

Since he could not certify, President Clinton used his authority to waive the Dole conditions, saying—disingenuously, I believe—that the waiver was ''necessary to assure the safe and timely withdrawal of United States forces from Haiti.''

Earlier this month, at least seven more Haitian citizens were killed apparently by members of the United States-hand picked, United States-trained, and United States-equipped Haiti national police. The victims were shot at point blank range. Witnesses report that they saw policemen do the killings. Mr. President, 24 hours after the shootings, the bodies had not been picked up, and no member of the Haiti judicial system had made an official report. The UN/OAS Mission has opened an inquiry into the killings, but not any member or agency of the Government of Haiti.

It is a sad commentary on the administration's policy that after the United States has spent $2 billion, and the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces endured hardship and danger, the government they were sent to restore and protect has participated in death squads, and done so with impunity.

As a final act of gratitude, President Aristide recognized the government of the man who recently ordered the murder of American citizens—Fidel Castro.

The Clinton administration's policy in Haiti is a failure. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3551

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to discuss, again, the ruling of the Chair. The Parliamentarian has ruled that an amendment is not relevant. A unanimous-consent request was entered allowing the calendar item to go forward, as set forth on page 3 of Monday's Calendar of Business.

A number of relevant amendments were allowed to be offered under the confines of the unanimous-consent request. Every Senator here agreed to this. Every Senator said only relevant amendments could be offered.

It seems rather unusual now that in spite of a unanimous-consent agreement—that does not mean 99 percent of the Senators, that does not mean 99 Senators, that means every Senator agreed to this unanimous-consent request—it seems rather unusual now we have some Senators who say that the referee, the Parliamentarian, ruled that this amendment is not relevant, ''But I'm going to do it my way anyway. I really didn't mean it when I agreed to that unanimous-consent request.''

For this body to rule otherwise—that is, to overrule the Parliamentarian—would be putting not only the Senate but certainly the Chair in a very, very awkward position, because it is clear that this amendment is not in order.

Mr. President, if the Parliamentarian is overruled, it would be like playing a

basketball game and you have Dennis Rodman as one of the players and you do not have a referee. Or you decide before any game, ''Let's just not have any referees. Let's just have a free-for-all.'' That is, in effect, what this will wind up doing. That is why we will never ever have another unanimous-consent agreement this year.

I think the Senators, especially the majority, really have to look at what precedent this sets. Every Senator has agreed that amendments can only be offered that are relevant. The referee, the Parliamentarian, through the Chair, has said an amendment is not relevant. To think now that we could come back as a body and overrule the referee does not seem very fair to me, or I think to most everyone it does not seem fair. I think it is going to be real hard to get work done around here.

Mr. President, I do not know, but I would think that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon—although I do not know—I have to think he would vote to sustain the Parliamentarian. For the chairman to vote otherwise would put this bill certainly at jeopardy and the precedents of this body.

I almost guarantee, although I have not talked to him, that the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from West Virginia, would vote to sustain the Chair. I think those of us who have not been in this body very long should follow these two great Senators.

There have been a number of statements made in the debate today, but let me speak now as a Senator from Nevada. Nevada wants no part of this split. We share a border that is 1,000 miles with the State of California—a 1,000-mile border. We do not want to stop having legal intercourse with the State of California. That would be wrong.

Mr. President, if, in fact, there is a commission like the Senator from California has talked about establishing that would come back and give reasons for why we should split off from the State of California in this circuit, I would be very strongly inclined to go along with that, but right now we have nothing.

As we have established clearly in the debate today, more circuits does not mean we are going to handle more cases. Quite frankly, it means just the opposite.

I think, if we have a fair study of the circuits, I do not know what can happen. We may want to combine circuits. We might wind up, instead of having 12 circuits, having 14 circuits, or instead of having 12 circuits, we might wind up having 8 circuits. I do not know. But let us have a good study by people appointed by the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, by the President, by the legislative body, having adequate staff so that they can work on this matter.

The majority party, the Chair included, I have heard on a number of occasions make statements about how important it is to balance this budget. The Presiding Officer today may feel more strongly about other things, but as far as I am concerned, having worked and served with the Presiding Officer, I do not know of a thing the Chair feels more strongly about than balancing the budget, because I heard remarks made on a continuing, repetitive basis from this floor about how important it is to get this Nation's financial house in order.

Using that as a foundation for what is important in this body, how can we justify without a hearing, without a commission made up of academics or judges or the private sector, how can we justify spending up to $60 million creating this new circuit with added expenses of millions of dollars every year? You cannot justify that. This must be laughable to the American public.

If the jury were the American public and we presented this to them, they would return a verdict very quickly saying, ''Well, I'm not sure there should be a split, but let's at least study the issue before that decision is made.''

To spend $60 million after we have already spent $100 million just renovating a building so that we can take care of this large ninth circuit does not make a lot of sense. So instead of spending $100 million, we are going to spend $160 million, plus the yearly increase in cost. It does not make sense to the American public. It certainly does not make sense to this Senator.

My staff handed me something earlier today that says: ''Further Information Relating to the Issue of Splitting the Ninth Circuit.'' I have not had a chance to read all this, but neither has anyone else in this body. We have had no hearings. There has been no commission set up to determine if we are doing the right thing, but there has been a lot said as to why we are doing the wrong thing: editorials, academics, judges. Just from this piece of paper that I have here, there are some things that I think we should be aware of in this body.

The American Bar Association Appellate Practice Committee, Subcommittee To Study the Circuit Size. I read an excerpt from that today saying that they thought it was a bad idea.

Thomas Baker wrote in the Arizona, I assume this is the Law Review 22 Ariz. S.L.J. 917 (1990) ''On Redrawing Circuit Boundaries—Why the Proposal To Divide the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Is Not Such a Good Idea.'' It is something of which we should be aware.

Carl Tobias, Emory Law School Law Review, 1995. His is entitled ''The Impoverished Idea of Circuit Splitting.''

The Honorable Clifford J. Wallace, who for many years was the chief judge of the ninth circuit and now is retired, wrote an article saying: ''The Ninth Circuit Should Not Be Split.''

There are a number of other references in this piece of paper indicating why the circuit should not be split.

But let us determine that from a basis rather than the seat of our pants in the Senate. We should do it with congressional hearings, but if you do not want to go the congressional hearing route, I am willing to go along with the suggestion of the Senator from California that we have a commission, because splitting the ninth circuit is a piecemeal approach, it is not the answer to a nationwide problem. We need to look at all the circuits. The 1996 legislation should not be based on a report that is 23 years old.

I would not even feel as upset if this amendment had followed the Hruska report that is 23 years old. They do not even do that. The Hruska report said you should split the State of California in two. They did not do that. They lumped California all together. As the Senator from California pointed out, there has never been anything done like that before.

Creating a new circuit is a costly proposition. The bench and bar oppose the ninth circuit split. Regionalism and ideology should play no part in the boundaries of circuits. The division of the fifth circuit provides no precedent for dividing the ninth circuit. The Hruska report shows that a large circuit can operate effectively, as the ninth circuit has done. The ninth circuit is doing a very good job.

But even on the merits, Mr. President, even if we are totally wrong and my friend from the State of Montana is totally right—that we are all wrong, assuming that for the purposes of this argument—we must sustain the point of order. The Parliamentarian has ruled this amendment is not germane—I am sorry, not relevant. So we should uphold the Chair. It is the only way we are going to have order in this body. To have this Senate overrule the ruling of the Chair would set a precedent that we would learn to regret. We would come to regret it.

So I hope that we will follow the recommendation, as I am confident will be of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, and vote to uphold the ruling of the Chair and have this matter declared, once and for all, not relevant.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, today I rise in strong opposition to the second-degree amendment introduced by the junior Senator from Montana to his original amendment to split the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, while also calling for a restructuring study of all the U.S. circuit courts of appeal.

I commend the Chair's ruling on the two points of order brought by both Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator REID earlier today to hold the Burns amendment irrelevant to this omnibus appropriations bill.

This amendment is the fourth attempt to break up the ninth circuit since 1983. These same drums have been

beaten before—the circuit is too big—the cases are not decided in a timely manner.

But this is, I fear, only a smokescreen for the real reason splitting the ninth circuit is proposed from time to time.

Many simply do not like the decisions rendered by the circuit.

Surely not all of the decisions in the ninth circuit, or for that matter, in any circuit come down the way all of us would like. I have even cosponsored legislation to reverse some ninth circuit decisions.

But I do not believe differences over the decisions rendered by the ninth circuit are adequate grounds to split the circuit.

What kind of precedent would Congress then be setting? Would a circuit court of appeals face possible reconfiguration, whenever Congress does not like the decisions being rendered? Does this Congress really want to support what is essentially judicial gerrymandering? I think not.

The ninth circuit serves nine western States, and has been one circuit for over 100 years. Whenever the issue of splitting the circuit is put to a vote of the judges and lawyers in the circuit, the vote is overwhelming to retain the circuit as it is currently.

Who better than those judges whose decisions are appealed to, and those lawyers who represent clients whose cases are heard by the ninth circuit to determine whether the circuit is working or not? It has been my experience that judges and lawyers have never been shy about stating an opinion when they think something needs to be changed.

The last study of the Federal circuit courts of appeal was the 1973 Hruska Commission. A fellow Nevadan, the Honorable Charles Wiggins, a ninth circuit court judge, served as a member of that Commission.

Judge Wiggins, a former Republican Congressman, originally supported a split of the ninth circuit. In his recent letter to Senator FEINSTEIN, however, he stated:

> My understanding of the role of the circuit courts in our system of federal justice has changed over the years from that which I held when the Hruska Commission issued its final report in 1973. At that time, I endorsed the recommendations of the Commission calling for a division of the 5th and 9th Circuits. I have grown wiser in the succeeding 22 years.''

We should heed Judge Wiggins experience—act wisely and not split the ninth circuit.

The last time a circuit court of appeals was split was 1980, when the fifth circuit was divided. And it should be noted that the judges of the fifth circuit unanimously requested the split—a situation we do not have with the ninth circuit.

Judge Wiggins recently wrote me,

> Circuit division is not the answer. It has not proved effective in reducing delays. The former 5th Circuit ranked sixth in case processing times just prior to its division into the 5th and 11th Circuits. Since the division, the new 5th Circuit is still ranked sixth or seventh, while the new 11th circuit now ranks 12th, the slowest of all the circuits. The 9th circuit Court of Appeals judges are the fastest in the nation in disposing of cases once the panel receives the case.

The ninth circuit has taken administrative steps to manage its caseload through innovative ways that other circuits use as models. The ninth circuit disposes of cases in 1.9 months from oral argument to rendering a decision.

This is 2 weeks less than the national average. This currently makes the ninth circuit the second most efficient circuit. It is obvious the circuit has recognized court management areas that needed improving, and has successfully addressed them.

I find it particularly ironic in this current political atmosphere with extremely tight Federal budget restraints that a proposal is being made to create a new circuit court. As my colleagues before me have discussed, it is estimated to cost $60 million to construct another Federal court house, and set up another circuit court. An additional $2 to $3 million is estimated to be needed to provide for the transition period. And thereafter, we would face the continuing costs of operating an additional circuit court. This makes no sense.

I reiterate my opposition to the proposal to split the ninth circuit. This circuit has worked well for the nine western States it serves, and will continue to do so into the future.

For those who believe the ninth circuit must be split, let the proposed commission to review all the U.S. circuit courts go forward. When the information necessary to determine whether any circuits need their geographical jurisdiction changed is available, we can then debate this issue intelligently.

But let us not split the ninth circuit prematurely. To implement the ninth circuit split at the same time as a commission is gathering the information to make that decision simply would make no sense.

This issue is simply too important to debate without all necessary information. I would hope my colleagues would join me tomorrow in voting to uphold the Chair's rulings on the irrelevancy of the Burns amendment.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3484, 3485, 3486, AND 3487

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to discuss an issue that I spoke about at great length last week. I want to speak very briefly about the amendments that I have put forward that are pending concerning the disaster relief portion of this bill and the emergency spending declaration that was attached to those spending provisions.

I really want to focus on just sort of the broad outline of what I am trying to accomplish in these amendments. There are really three subjects that the amendments deal with. The first subject really is the immediate subject, which is, are we going to offset the money that we spent here in the Senate bill with other spending reductions in the bill so we do not add to the deficit this year? That is the first issue.

The second issue is, do we get a bill out of conference that does not add to the deficit?

Third, what do we do long term to deal with the issue of disaster relief?

Let me address all three of those, if I can, and discuss the amendments that I have to take those subjects on. First, the Senate bill. We had an amendment by the Senator from Texas and me. Senator GRAMM and I put forward an amendment to offset the spending with an across-the-board cut in all the nondefense discretionary appropriations accounts. We had 45 votes on that, which I consider is a pretty good showing, but not good enough.

We are continuing to look. I have three amendments filed, and, in fact, am working on a fourth with the Appropriations Committee and the leadership, to try to come up with a way where we can pass a bill here in the U.S. Senate that does not add to the deficit this year.

So I am hopeful that in the end, whether we do it with the amendments that I have pending or whether we can come up with a modification to one of those amendments to accomplish a deficit-neutral bill in this bill that we are working on, I am confident that we can make that happen. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is the issue in conference. In the Senate, as I said before, I am hopeful we can get a bill that comes out of here that does not add to the deficit. The House has already put forward a bill that does not—that does not—increase the deficit. So I have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which would instruct the conferees to hold firm and come out with a bill that is within the budget caps that we set in the budget resolution last year, so we do not add additional red ink in this round of trying to finish the appropriations process for the rest of this year. So we have something that clearly states the Senate is on record that we should pay for the disaster relief funds in this bill.

Third—and this gets to, I think, a very important issue, and I am hopeful we can get very broad support for this—is another sense-of-the-Senate that the Congress and the relevant committees examine how we deal with disaster relief. How we deal with disaster relief now is—actually, we do not. We appropriate a few hundred million dollars, very little money relative to the amount of disasters that we have in this country, that are eligible for Federal relief. We appropriate a few hundred million dollars a year to FEMA and then, as the disasters come along, as they certainly do—whether they are earthquakes in California or whether they are fires in Texas or whether they are floods in Pennsylvania or hurricanes in South Carolina, we

have them—we have a Federal role to play in helping the people who have been hurt, whether it is physically or whether it is their property or with the public roads or bridges, infrastructure.

There is a Federal role to play in assisting an area, a community, that has been hit. So the question is, how do we pay for it? How do we budget for it? And what we do right now is we do not budget for it, and we pay for it by putting it on the next generation's credit card, so to speak. The difference with the next generation's credit card is that unlike most credit cards we have to pay after 30 days—we get charged interest, but eventually we pay it back—this credit card, we never pay it back, we just keep paying interest on it forever, and the future generations pay forever and ever and ever.

So what we ask is, look at a long-term solution. How can we, within the budget, allocate resources as disasters come up, to make sure we can be fiscally responsible, and at the same time provide the needed assistance for disasters as they occur across this country? That is the last leg or last subject area that I am trying to address with these amendments that I have on the floor.

I am hopeful we can get support for all three subjects, fixing the Senate bill, getting a bill out of conference and to the President's desk that does not add to the deficit, and No. 3, coming up with a suggestion to the Congress that the relevant committees do some good work and determine how we can begin to pay for disasters within the budget.

Senator GRAMM and I mentioned last week when we were debating his amendment that over the past 7 years, we have added $100 billion to the deficit—$100 billion to the deficit—in disaster declarations. They have been things from very serious, as I said before—floods, earthquakes, hurricanes, tornadoes, et cetera—to things such as declaring an emergency because we had a 6-percent rate of unemployment and we wanted to pay extended unemployment compensation benefits.

There really is a very loose standard of what is an emergency. In fact, there is no standard of what an emergency is. It is whatever the President declares, whatever the Congress declares. I think we need to do a little better than that. I think we have to have some guidelines and we have to have some procedures by which we are going to declare emergencies and which would cause us to increase the deficit. That is an appropriate standard.

That is something, frankly, we should have done when we put together the emergency provisions in the 1990 Budget Act in the first place, but we did not. Those who argued for some sort of parameters to define an emergency hearkened back then that we were going to see everything that was politically popular for the moment declared an emergency and thrown on the deficit. I think their fears have been brought to fruition. We have, as I said before, $100 billion of such spending.

I want to make it very clear that we have an obligation here to provide emergency disaster relief for communities in States that are hit. I am for that. I want to make sure that we can do that and we do it properly, but I think we have to make sure we do it within the confines of trying to get to a much more responsible fiscal policy here in Washington, to a balanced budget, to a better America and, again, avoiding this knee-jerk reaction we have had in this town for a long, long time, that if we have a problem, and we do not want to take money from some area of the budget that may have your name attached to a program, or whatever the case may be, and put it to where the emergency is, that instead we just add it to the deficit.

I think that is irresponsible behavior, and it is certainly not in keeping with the changes that have occurred since the 1994 election. We focused so much of our time and energy on trying to balance this budget, but when an emergency comes along that we frankly should have budgeted for but did not budget for, we are the first to run, even now, and talk about, well, we have just got to put it on the deficit. I think it is talking out of both sides of your mouth and is not what we should be doing here, or what the public expects us to be doing.

We are talking $1.2 billion out of $1.6 trillion that we will spend this year. Somewhere around we can find some money in a lot of areas of Government to put where it should go, which is to pay for this emergency. The three things I am hoping to accomplish tomorrow, whether we can do it, and I hope we can, by agreement or consent on both sides of the aisle, is something frankly that both Democrats and Republicans should be for: Fiscal responsibility, a long-term solution, and more of a structure to funding emergencies and standing up for the Senate not to be fiscally irresponsible and adding to the deficit in this appropriations process.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3551

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, not to belabor the point, but earlier I made the point about the duplicative costs of the ninth circuit split proposal, the inordinate costs of the proposal, the unnecessary costs of the proposal, the unfair division that the Burns bill presents.

I would like to just clarify what I said. What I said was that California, Hawaii, Guam, and Northern Marianas have currently 62 percent of the caseload; Alaska, Arizona, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana have 38 percent. In the Burns proposal, the group of States with 62 percent of the cases get 15 judges, and the States with only 38 percent of the caseload get 13 judges. The States with 62 percent of the cases end up getting proportionately fewer judges relative to caseload. According to ninth circuit statistics for 1995, the proposed new twelfth circuit would have only 765 filings per three-judge panel, whereas the ninth circuit would have 1,065 filings per three-judge panel. How this huge caseload is going to be handled with a disproportionately low number of judges should cause some concern because this will still remain a very large circuit. It will be unable to function due to a heavy backlog of cases.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF THE AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC CONCERNING THE PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 132

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153 (b), (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Argentine Republic Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy with accompanying annex and agreed minute. I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning